



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

references for *two* in the old edition. Without pursuing this examination further, it is hoped that this is sufficient to show the decided improvements of the present edition made by Mr. Bradley.

The editor prefixes a "Comparative Table of References to Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*," showing the correspondences of the Chaucer Society's Six-Text edition, which is cited under the words, with Tyrwhitt's, Wright's, Morris's, and Bell and Skeat's editions, so that the possessor of any one of those editions has an easy means of reference to any passage cited. A "List of General Abbreviations and Signs" is also prefixed, and some five pages of "Additions and Corrections" appended. For these the editor makes due apology, and particularly for the errors of the press, but no one who has ever carried a book, or even an article, through the press will criticise these very severely. It is undoubtedly the duty of an editor to exercise all reasonable care against such errors, but when, after repeated re-reading of the proof-sheets, especially such difficult proofs as those of a dictionary, errors will crop out, they must be leniently judged. I am sure that all scholars will be greatly indebted to Mr. Bradley for the labor he has bestowed upon this valuable work. Until the completion of Maetzner's greater dictionary, which, after many years of labor, has reached only the letter J, there is nothing to take its place. It may be confidently commended to all students of Middle-English.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes: Specimens of the Pre-Elizabethan Drama. Edited, with an Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by ALFRED W. POLLARD, M.A. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1890 (pp. lx, 250).

Mr. Pollard thinks that "the small attention devoted to the pre-Elizabethan drama in all histories of English literature is the best excuse for the appearance of the present volume of Specimens," and he is certainly right. Until the publication of Miss L. T. Smith's edition of the York Plays in 1885, the student was practically without the means of making himself acquainted with these interesting relics of the older English drama, for the old editions of the Chester, Towneley, and Coventry Plays were out of print, and virtually inaccessible to the private student. Here we have in convenient form a small volume with sufficient specimens to enable a student to acquaint himself practically with these plays. Mr. Pollard makes selections from each of the four series above-mentioned, and from eight other plays: Mary Magdalene, The Castell of Perseverance, Everyman, Interlude of the Four Elements, Skelton's Magnyfycence, Heywood's The Pardoner and the Frere, Thersytes, and Bale's King John. The introduction is sufficiently full, beginning with the *Χριστὸς Πάσχω*, attributed by all previous historians of the drama to the church father of the fourth century, Gregory of Nazianzus, but now denied to him, after the investigations of Dr. J. G. Brambs (1885), and assigned to the tenth century. The contemporary Latin plays, after Terence, of Hroswitha, the nun of Gandersheim, are duly noticed, but set aside as "exotics," "having nothing to do with the services of the Church."

The Miracle Plays, however, had their origin in the representations of scenes from the life of our Lord, made at the Easter services some time during the

thirteenth century, and an Orleans MS of that date contains ten of these Latin plays, although Mr. Pollard thinks that "its contents were probably composed before the year 1200, and may thus be reckoned as contemporaneous with those of Hilarius." This Hilarius, supposed to be an Englishman, was a pupil of Abelard, and has left us three Latin plays, one on the history of Daniel, another on the Raising of Lazarus, and a third on Saint Nicholas. Matthew Paris refers to the performance of a miracle play in honor of St. Katherine at Dunstable before 1119, perhaps before 1100, by a certain Geoffrey, later Abbot of St. Albans, and this is the first reference that we have to such a performance in England. But I must refer to the interesting Introduction of Mr. Pollard for a further account of the Miracle Plays, and their successors, the Moralities and Interludes. It bears out his statement that he has endeavored to make the best use of the labors of his predecessors. A few slight corrections may be noticed. In referring to ten Brink's second volume, not yet translated, the sign '§' should be 'p.'; on p. xxii, note 2, *wherthorn* should be *wherthoru*; p. xxxvii, line nine from end, 'third' should be 'fourth'; on p. xlii, *Accidie* is translated 'gluttony' instead of 'sloth.' The Introduction closes with a notice of Bale's *King John*, written probably in the reign of Edward VI, and a mention of the last performances of the Miracle Plays in the reign of Elizabeth, after the rise of the regular drama.

The text of the Specimens fills 176 pages, the notes 48, and the glossary 26.

If a general criticism were made, it would be that the notes and glossary might have been fuller, especially to the Towneley Play in the northern dialect, *Secunda Pastorum*, the droll story of the stealing of the sheep by Mak and his effort to pass it off as his child, in which he is unsuccessful and gets tossed for his theft. The editor would have done well to append to the introduction, or notes, some account of the grammar and dialectic forms, as the student taking up the earlier plays without previous acquaintance with Middle English, will miss it.

Some omissions of words have been noticed in the glossary, e. g. *apared*, K. J. 1287, although there is a note on the passage; *derville*, T. 342, *et al.*, possibly regarded as not needing to be inserted; *dowte*, T. 64; *fare*, sb., Y. 613; *feft*, T. 631; *lyppers*, Sk. 1930, possibly like *derville*; *rouge*, Ch.¹ 290; *scoured*, P. F. 602; and a few passages where a different meaning would suit the context better; *hyen*, C. P. (239)? (238), is rather 'exalt' than 'hasten'; *plye*, K. J. 2164, 'enfold, wrap,' rather than 'apply oneself to'; under *mament*, M. M. 1545 is a wrong reference, and in 1557 *mamentes* = 'idols,' which meaning is omitted; in this line also *pott* is printed *post* in the glossary, and in 1540 M. M. 'pleyeauntly' is in gl. 'plezeautntly,' where 3 = z; in M. M. 624, too, *wytlytsaff* is in gl. *wytlytsauf*. In note on M. M. 484 'Satan' should be 'Luxuria,' and I should have noted above that in T. 640 'Mak' seems to have dropped out at the beginning of the line. In note on T. 294 'He' seems to be *erratum* for 'i. e.' and on S. K. 1909 (? 1911) 'substantive' should be 'verb'; in Ch.¹ 296 *oughte wher* is questionable for 'anywhere,' except as very bad spelling; *te* may be error of the scribe; in note on P. F. 36 *On* should be *in*; and in note on K. J. 1292 *is* should be *be*—but these are mostly oversights easily corrected when attention is called to them.

In a few passages exception might be taken, I think, to some of Mr. Pol-

lard's translations, but it would prolong this notice to too great length to discuss them. The book is a useful addition to the valuable series of publications that have issued from the Clarendon Press, and a slight revision can be easily made. In a second edition I hope more attention will be paid to the grammar, especially of the earlier specimens. Much useful instruction in Middle English can be derived from a study of the dialectic forms. Several forms occur here which are not found in Stratmann's *M. E. Dictionary*, even as revised by Mr. Bradley, but by the aid of the latter this glossary may be improved. As showing dialectic pronunciation attention may be called to *onste* (once), Ch.² 319, *hunder* (under), T. 24; and *perhenuall*, M. M. 637; also to what is regarded as a modern provincialism, *I reken*, K. J. 1315, although the glossary here gives *reke*, the older form. An appendix contains extracts from two Latin plays, one on the Resurrection and the other, by Hilarius, on St. Nicholas, from *The Harrowing of Hell*, ed. Mall, and from the play of Abraham and Isaac, *Anglia VII*, but without notes, and some words in the texts are omitted in the glossary, as *yeyed*, A. I. 332, perhaps = *joied*, and *harly*, A. I. 350; *leere*, H. H. 166 is erratum for *leeve*.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Shelley, *Adonais*. Edited, with introduction and notes, by WILLIAM MICHAEL ROSSETTI. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1891.

Mr. Rossetti's edition of Shelley's *Adonais* belongs to the Clarendon Press Series, of which one is accustomed to hear good things said, but this time, to be frank, Shelley has been unfortunate in his editor. It is not an insignificant fact that of the two books found in the pocket of the drowned poet one was a Sophokles, and it is not going too far to say that the Greek element in Shelley is half of his soul, and he who would edit him aright must have Sophokles in his head as Shelley had Sophokles in his pocket. But the present commentator has not thought it necessary to trace the Greek threads in Shelley's diction beyond the pieces of Greek embroidery that the poet had openly wrought into his poem from Bion and from Moschos; and reminiscences of Aischylos and Pindar pass unheeded, as well as reminiscences of Catullus and Lucretius, who deserve to keep company with the Greeks. In lieu of such a study of the weft of Shelley's poetry we have heavy prose paraphrase, we have hopeless puzzlements over passages that are to be conceived poetically or not at all. Here the poet is taken to task for his grammar, and there he is charged with a miserable subservience to the needs of rhyme, as if a true poet's thought were not born singing. In the lines

Great and mean

Meet massed in death, who lends what life must borrow,

'borrow' is supposed to be due to 'morrow' and 'sorrow,' rather than to the vast wealth of Pluto's realm, the *Orci thesaurus*, familiar to every classical scholar. 'Clear sprite,' used of Milton, is said to be 'one of the least tolerable make-rhymes in the whole range of English poetry.' Assuredly any one that knows the history of 'spright' and 'sprite' will forgive the poet his bit of anti-quarianism and rebel against Mr. Rossetti's hard sentence. 'Sprite' is better